

low income children in each of the participating States as compared to a representative sample of non-participating States.

“(p) STATE PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT.—Following the submission of an application fulfilling all requirements of this section, a State that meets all eligibility requirements set forth in section 643A(a)(2) and is selected by the Secretary to participate in the demonstration program under this section shall:

“(1) maintain or increase fiscal year 2007 State funding levels for early childhood education;

“(2) provide an additional contribution of non-federal funds equal to 5 percent of the State’s Federal Head Start allotment;

“(3) use Head Start funding only for the purposes of Head Start as described in section 636;

“(4) provide all comprehensive social services currently available to Head Start children, including health and nutrition;

“(5) develop a strategy to maximize parental involvement to enable parents to become full partners in the education of their children;

“(6) demonstrate that the qualifications and credentials for early childhood teachers meet or exceed the standards in section 648A(a)(2)(A), (B), and (C);

“(7) enforce quality standards for school readiness that are aligned with K–12 educational standards and generally meet or exceed the Federal Head Start performance standards;

“(8) continue funding, for a period of 60 months, all current Head Start grantees as described in section 643A(d);

“(9) provide services described in section 641A that are at least as extensive as were provided, and to at least as many low-income children and families in the State, in each fiscal year as were provided such services in the base year;

“(10) establish a comprehensive collaboration effort to integrate Head Start, state-funded pre-kindergarten programs, Even Start, Title I preschool, and Early Reading First;

“(11) participate in independent evaluations of the demonstration program authorized under this subchapter; and

“(12) submit to Federal oversight by the Secretary.

“(q) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘base year’ means the fiscal year 2007.”

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 348, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this amendment. I would urge my colleagues to support it. This is an amendment of expansion and educational opportunities for our young children.

In 1965, when Head Start was implemented, State-run early childhood development programs didn’t exist. Since then, and most recently, and in the past 15 years, States have invested considerable resources into early childhood initiatives. This amendment seeks to provide an incredible opportunity for eight States to participate in a 5-year demonstration program and leverage their resources and experience to improve school readiness.

It would allow eight States to coordinate Head Start and early childhood State-run programs, thus improving

coordination, preventing duplication and expanding the number of children that can be served by the early childhood services. To carry it out, safeguards would be put in place. States would have to ensure that participants receive services that are as good or better than those in the Head Start program, including health, nutrition, mental health services on top of the educational services.

Enacting a demonstration program will result in expanding the number of children that can be served, which is not possible in Head Start or just a State-run program alone. This is an innovative program that would help more children in our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, we are here today to authorize the Head Start program. What this amendment would do would simply end Head Start in those eight States as we know it. There would be no requirement that those States would take the money that we have set aside, that we have worked hard to provide within the budget for the Head Start program and use it to implement a program that is anything like Head Start, because there would simply be no requirements on that money to provide the kind of comprehensive programs that are now required under the Head Start program that have demonstrated the success that we just spent an hour with speakers from both sides of the aisle attesting to in their own districts or on a national basis as members of the committee have talked about what we are doing in this reauthorization. These States would be eligible for these funds without demonstrating any expertise or commitment to the high quality of this proven preschool program.

Essentially that’s the end of it in those eight States. Now, maybe one of those States will have a strong commitment to Head Start and all the rest of it. That’s what Head Start is. That’s what Head Start is. Why are we running this money through another filter system to recreate the Head Start program? We already require, and we went through a series of hearings about coordination with the States to make sure that Head Start coordinates with other State programs and State agencies.

But we also know that because of what we have done with Head Start over the years, where we have provided reauthorization after reauthorization, the continuous improvement of the programs that are integral to the success of Head Start and to the success of the children, where we have used sci-

entific-based educational and performance standards, where we have provided for accountability and oversight and evaluation of the program, where we have provided for the parent policy councils, all of these things that have been integral to this program over this time to bring it to a point now where we can see that it demonstrates a marked impact on these young children in closing the achievement gap for these children and getting them ready and the skills that they will need for early reading, for early math, for early writing, that is what this program does.

There are not many States that do any of that. They have a lot of early childhood programs. They have a lot of child care programs, they have a lot of it. But they don’t have this comprehensive program. That’s why this is considered the premier program in the Nation for the education and the development of these young children. That is why we should not support this block grant amendment.

I daresay that we have watched over the last decades effort after effort be made to block grant programs. Generally, where they have been successful, they have been the first step to the budget cuts, to the loss of quality. That’s what’s involved here.

Again, when we structured this legislation, and in consideration of the budget and the increases in the money, we are putting 60 percent of the money into quality, into teacher and professional development, into salaries, because we recognize that we have to have that continuous update and that improvement of the Head Start program.

Voting for this amendment is not to vote for Head Start; it’s to vote for something, but it’s not to vote for Head Start. It’s, in fact, detrimental because that money, then, is out of the Head Start system to be used for whatever purposes. In fact, you can take this Federal money and then withdraw the local money. There is no requirement in this amendment that there be a maintenance of effort by a State to do this.

What have you really done? You have taken money for the Federal taxpayers that paid into this program that we have decided on a bipartisan basis should go for the Head Start program. You said, oh, you can give it to a State, and they can draw their money out the bottom. So we put the taxpayers’ money in at the top, and the State takes the money out of the bottom.

That is not going to improve quality. That is not going to improve access. Now, you can argue that maybe you can add a lot of children to a program, a program, not the Head Start program, because the Head Start program is expensive because we do it the way we should be doing, the way it has been scientifically analyzed and supported by the data.

You can put a lot of kids in low-quality programs, but that is not what we